

PY 2020 Nationwide Participant Evaluation of SCSEP

March 25, 2022

Overview

For the PY 2020 participant survey, a nationwide random sample of 16,126 participants was selected. The first wave of surveys was mailed in April 2021. The third and last wave of data collection was closed in September 2021. This report includes the nationwide results for all survey questions. Appendix A contains the results of each survey question at the national grantee, state grantee, and nationwide levels. An analysis of individual grantee performance is provided for each grantee in separate reports.

Overall Satisfaction: The American Customer Satisfaction Index

The American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) continues to be the standard for measuring overall satisfaction. The nationwide participant ACSI score for PY 2020 is 87.2, significantly higher than the 82.6 score in PY 2019 and higher than the ACSI score for most previous years. The average ACSI score compares very favorably with ACSI scores from non-profit, for-profit, and government organizations around the country and the world where the ACSI is used.

For PY 2020, of the 16,126 surveys mailed, 9605 participants returned surveys with valid responses to the first three questions that make up the ACSI; only these participants with valid responses to the first three questions are included in the response rate and in the other survey analyses below. This year's response rate, 59.5 percent, is more than 9 points higher than the PY 2019 rate of 50.4%. Response rates and ACSI scores for all grantees are provided in the Appendix A.

Who Answered the Survey?

The survey sample was and has always been generally representative of the SCSEP population nationwide. It is a stratified, random sample of all eligible participants, those who received service at any time within the twelve months prior to the drawing of the survey sample in April 2020. A survey is considered useable (counted as a valid return)¹ if the respondent answered the three questions that constitute the ACSI.

Most characteristics of the respondents, including race, ethnicity and education, are similar to the SCSEP population as a whole. There are some differences between the SCSEP population and survey respondents in regard to the number with less than a high school diploma and the percentage of Asians and American Indians. Differences were also evident in regard to age at enrollment and the percentage of those with a few barriers to employment (primarily disability, low literacy skills, homeless or at risk for homelessness, severely limited employment prospects, and age 75 or over). However, those differences have no impact on the representativeness of the survey responses.² Complete tables with demographics and characteristics of the survey respondents are provided in Appendix B. Below is a brief summary of the demographics of the respondents:

- The average age is 65.4
- 69.2 percent are female and 30.8 percent male

¹ Calculating and Reporting Survey Response Rates – Revised September 2009, GAO internal guidance.

² A study in 2014 by statisticians at the University of Connecticut determined that those who responded from the sample were also generally representative of the entire sample.

- 37.3 percent have a high school diploma or less. The remaining 62.8 percent have some post-secondary education, degree or certificate
- 55.6 percent are racial minorities, and 10.8 percent are Hispanic.

To complete the picture of SCSEP participants, we report on characteristics that have been identified in Title V of the Older Americans Act (OAA) as creating significant barriers to employment. The list of barriers includes disability, severe disability, limited English proficiency, low literacy skills, living in a rural area, low unemployment prospects, failing to find employment after receiving WIOA services, being homeless or at risk of homelessness, being a veteran, being frail, old enough for social security but not receiving any benefits, having severely limited employment prospects in an area of persistent unemployment, being 75 or older, and being formerly incarcerated. On average, participants in the sample have 3.00 barriers each, a somewhat higher average number of barriers than reported in the PY 2019 survey, in which the average number of barriers was 2.76.

The other defining characteristic of the respondents is their program status at the time they took the survey: 71.5 percent of the respondents were still in the program; 28.5 percent of the respondents had exited the program. Of those who had exited:

- 32 percent of the respondents exited for regular employment
- 1.2 percent of the respondents exited for self-employment
- 66.8 percent of the respondents exited for reasons other than employment

The percent of the sample that were still in the program is a little higher than the percent in PY 2019.

The Impact of COVID-19

Question 4 was new for PY 2020. It was developed to obtain some sense of how COVID had altered, if at all, participants' experiences with the program. Table 1, below, lists a number of possible effects and the number and percentage of participants that experienced each effect. The respondents were able to endorse all effects that applied. The last column indicates the average ACSI score for those individuals indicating they experienced that particular effect. By far, the most commonly experienced effects were participants not being allowed to go to their host agency assignment and the concomitant loss of social contact.

Table 1. Effect of COVID

Q4. How has the COVID-19 pandemic affected you as a SCSEP participant?	Count	Percent	ACSI Score
1. I was not allowed to go to my assigned host agency.	5339	31.2%	87.4
2. I refused to go to my assignment because I was afraid I would get sick.	616	3.6%	84.8
3. I went to my host agency, but I was worried about getting sick when traveling to and from the assignment or working at my assignment.	1033	6.0%	85.1
4. I lost my host agency assignment and the money associated with that assignment.	467	2.7%	78.1
5. I received pay but missed the social contact I would have had if I had been able to go to my assignment.	5418	31.6%	88.7
6. I was not able to find unsubsidized employment because employers are closed or not hiring.	1855	10.8%	84.5
7. I experienced little or no effect from the COVID-19 pandemic.	2400	14.0%	89.2

It is worth noting that the ACSI scores for those experiencing these different effects were all extremely high and essentially the same, except for the small number of participants who indicated that they lost the

host agency assignment and the money associated with it, reinforcing the importance of wages to SCSEP participants, especially in a time of economic and social disruption. See Question 17 in Table 9.

It is also important to note that the pandemic may have impacted the survey results in several respects. As reported above, both the average response rate and the ACSI score were substantially and significantly higher than in recent surveys. In addition, the scores for several questions about services and employment preparation received were higher despite the suspension of many host agency assignments, additional training, and post-exit placements due to the pandemic. We do not know what accounts for this general increase in appreciation of SCSEP. However, most participants who were unable to work in their host agency assignments during the pandemic received paid sick leave in the amount of their previous wages. It is possible that the continuation of their wages during a time when so many people lost their income engendered a sense of gratitude (often referred to as the halo effect³) that made the respondents more positive in their assessments of many aspects of the program.

Participants' Expectations for the Program

Question 5 (Question 4 in the PY 2015-PY 2019 surveys) asks participants to indicate the primary reason(s) they enrolled in the program. Respondents could choose as many reasons as they deemed appropriate; therefore, the total number of answers is substantially higher than the number of survey respondents. The responses to the eight options in Table 2 indicate a wide range of reasons for enrolling in the program. The participants, on average, endorsed about 3.4 reasons, similar to PY 2019 and PY 2018. The most frequently endorsed reasons were increasing their income, feeling more useful and independent, and obtaining a part-time job. The next most frequent endorsements were for participating in training and host agency activities, providing service to the community, and meeting new people. It is notable that the lowest percentage was for full-time work. This is consistent with data from SPARQ that show participants who exited were working an average of 29 hours per week in unsubsidized employment. The results this year are nearly identical to those from PY 2019.

Table 2. Reasons for Enrollment

5. The primary reason(s) I enrolled in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP were to:	Count	Percent of All Responses
1 Obtain a full-time job after completing the program.	2303	7.0%
2 Obtain a part-time job after completing the program	5268	16.0%
3 Participate in the program's training and host agency activities	4286	13.0%
4 Provide service to my community	4265	12.9%
5 Meet new people	4234	12.8%
6. Increase my income	6018	18.2%
7 Feel more useful and independent	5985	18.1%
8 Other	641	1.9%

³ Thorndike, E.L. (1920). A constant error in psychological ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4(1), 25–29.

How Participants Rate Their Treatment in the Program

One of the great strengths of the program has always been the way staff treat participants. As evident in Table 3, participants give high ratings to all three ways staff worked with them while in the program.⁴ These scores are similar to those in previous years and reconfirm the care and concern with which staff work with the participants.

Table 3. Treatment of Participants

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
6. At the time I enrolled, the Older worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	9473	9.1	1	10
7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	9384	8.9	1	10
10. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	9287	8.9	1	10

Participants' Experience in the Host Agency

The three questions below in Table 4 relate directly to the nature of participants' experience at the host agency. Question 14 is similar to Questions 6, 7, and 10 (Table 3 above) in reflecting the sense of belonging that can be created in the host agency. The other two questions (Questions 11 and 12) focus explicitly on training, a crucial aspect of the host agency assignment. The highest rating (9.0) is for Question 14, how comfortable participants feel at the host agency assignment. The lowest rating (8.1) is for Question 12, whether participants have a say in the types of skills they would gain at the host agency. However, this rating is 0.5 points higher than in PY 2019. The rating for receiving training to be successful in the host agency assignment, Question 11, is 8.6, mid-way between the other two ratings. All the scores are significantly higher than those recorded in PY 2019.

Question 12 gives more detailed insight into the host agency as a training site and clearly shows that participants desire more input into the skills and types of training they receive. The higher average score for this year is difficult to explain other than the potential of a "halo effect." During the last two years, most participants received at least some paid sick leave, which may have increased ratings for most aspects of the program, even when participants' experience of many program components was limited or eliminated while participants were unable to go to their host agency assignments.

Table 4. Host Agency Experience

	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
11. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	8977	8.6	1	10
12. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	9022	8.1	1	10
14. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	9283	9.0	1	10

⁴ Unless otherwise noted, questions are scored on a 1-10 scale.

Participant Outcomes

There are two types of outcomes derived from the survey and administrative data: outcomes achieved while participants are in the program and outcomes associated with employment after participants leave the program.

The most direct outcomes within the program are associated with the one of the two principal purposes of the program: preparing participants for employment. Question 21 in Table 5 asks if participants felt that SCSEP prepared them for employment in different industry sectors. There were 966 respondents who had a placement after leaving the program, including 69 who were self-employed. The analysis in Table 5 is limited to those exiters.⁵ The respondents were able to choose all sectors in which they felt prepared for employment (nonprofit, government, or for-profit) or to indicate that they felt unprepared for any sector.

Because multiple responses were allowed for Question 21, there are two different questions to ask of the data. First, what number and percent of individuals felt prepared for a particular employment sector? The 560 individuals who responded to Q21 made a total of 899 choices as shown in Table 5. Nationwide, the most frequently endorsed sector was nonprofit organizations (39.5%), which makes sense given that most participants' host agency training sites are nonprofit organizations. Preparation for government and for-profit sectors was less frequently endorsed, with 23 percent for government and 32.9 percent for the for-profit sector. The difference of 6.6 points between preparation for the nonprofit and for-profit sectors is much smaller than the difference in PY 2019, 11.9%. The percent who felt prepared for the for-profit sector is significantly higher than in PY 2019.

41 respondents indicated they were not prepared for employment in any organization or business. This number equates to 4.6% of all responses and 7.3% of all respondents. In conjunction with the improvement on the score for Question 12 above (participants having a say in the types of skills they would gain), these scores suggest that participants perceived that the program is providing more appropriate and effective training even though such training was curtailed during the pandemic.

Table 5. Prepared for Employment

21. Do you feel that your participation in the Older Worker Program prepared you for employment in these organizations?	Count	Percent of All Responses
I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization	355	39.5%
I felt prepared for employment in a government organization	207	23.0%
I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business	296	32.9%
I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business	41	4.6%
Total Response Choices	899	

A second way of looking at Question 21 is shown in Table 5a. This variable, constructed from the Question 21 data, shows for how many sectors (if any) participants felt they were prepared. Of the 560 who responded to this question, 122 participants saw themselves prepared in all three sectors, 95 saw themselves prepared in two of the three sectors, and 302 saw themselves prepared for one sector, most often the nonprofit sector. 7.3 percent of respondents did not indicate feeling prepared in any sector. These responses are similar to those in PY 2019.

⁵ Although only those who exited with employment were included in the findings in Table 5, the results were not substantially different when we included all respondents who answered this question, including those who did not exit or did not have employment upon exiting.

Table 5a: Prepared for Employment

Number of Sectors	Count	Percent of Respondents
1 sector	302	53.9%
2 sectors	95	17.0%
All 3 sectors	122	21.8%
No sectors	41	7.3%

Another aspect of preparation is covered in Question 19. The data for this question regarding preparation for success in the workforce are presented in Table 6. The score for helping prepare participants for success is significantly higher than the score of 8.1 in PY 2019.

Table 6. Preparation for Success in Workforce

19. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	9199	8.5	1	10

Two health outcomes continue to be collected in this survey. Table 7 shows the responses to Question 15. 29.9 percent indicate they are in better physical health, and 60.2% indicate their health is about the same. Only 9.9 percent indicate that their health declined in the course of participation. These results are slightly more positive than those in the prior four years.

Table 7. Physical Health

		Count	Percent
15. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?	Better	2774	29.9%
	Worse	917	9.9%
	About the same	5580	60.2%

The second health question asks about mental health. As in previous years, the program produces strong, positive results as shown in Table 8. Nearly 77 percent indicated that they were either “a little more” or “much more positive” in their outlook on life as a result of participating in the program. This is about the 3-5 points higher than in the four prior surveys and may be another example of the halo effect’s impact in the time of COVID.

Table 8. Mental Health

		Count	Percent
16. Compared to the time before you started working with the Older Worker Program/SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	160	1.7%
	A little more negative	379	4.0%
	About the same	1683	17.9%
	A little more positive	2523	26.8%
	Much more positive	4663	49.6%

Along with physical and mental health, the program can affect participants' financial wellbeing. We know from Question 4 that many participants come to SCSEP hoping to increase their income. Question 17 attempts to put a finer point on the issue of financial health by asking about the importance of income from SCSEP for meeting basic expenses. As evident in Table 9, almost 85% of the respondents moderately to strongly agreed (ratings of 8, 9, or 10) that the pay from SCSEP was important to meeting basic expenses. This is about 10-11 points higher than in the prior four years.

Table 9. SCSEP Wages

17. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.		Count	Percent
	1 Strongly disagree	179	1.9%
	2	84	0.9%
	3	103	1.1%
	4	113	1.2%
	5	302	3.2%
	6	261	2.8%
	7	423	4.5%
	8	792	8.3%
	9	977	10.3%
	10 Strongly agree	6255	65.9%

One potentially negative impact can arise if participants are pressured to leave a host agency assignment before they felt they were ready can have on those individuals. Table 10 shows that very few participants feel that they have had such pressure, similar to the result for PY 2019. It is important that the percent pressured remains as small as possible since the experience of being pressured lowers overall satisfaction by more than 23 points.

Table 10. Pressure to Leave Host Agency

18. During my host agency assignment, the Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.		Count	Percent
	Yes	393	6.2%
	No	5974	93.6%
	Doesn't apply	17	0.3%

Detailed Analysis of Computer Training

Earlier surveys had asked about computer training but not with the level of detail necessary for providing guidance to the grantees. Table 11 shows not only whether participants received computer training but also whether the training was appropriately targeted to the participants' needs. As was true in PY 2018 and PY 2019, a third (34.9%) of the participants received the computer training they needed. About a quarter (24.7%) did not need computer training and did not receive any. In total, computer training was properly targeted for more than 59 percent of the participants. However, 22.1 percent needed computer training and received little or none, and another 11.2 percent received computer training that did not meet their needs. Overall, the targeting of training was not substantially changed from the surveys of the four prior years.

Computer training continues to be an important aspect of helping older workers prepare for an ever more computerized work environment. With computer training failing to meet the needs of a third of participants, there is much room for improvement. The individual grantee reports will provide clearer guidance on this issue for local programs.

Table 11. Computer Training

13. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	Count	Percent
I received the computer training I needed	3209	34.9%
I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1026	11.2%
I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2033	22.1%
I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	660	7.2%
I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	2268	24.7%

Supportive Services

In addition to providing training, grantees are required to assess whether participants need supportive services in order to successfully participate in SCSEP and, if so, to ensure that services are provided. In Table 12, Question 8 asks if supportive services were provided when needed. Of 9,437 participants who responded to the question, 3,140 (33.3%) indicated they did not need any supportive services. Of the 6,295 who did indicate a need for supportive services, 30.7 percent disagreed or were neutral (score of 1-5 out of 10) that the assistance met their needs. Over 69% rated the assistance as positive (6-10 out of 10). The percentage indicating a positive rating was similar to PY 2019, when two-thirds of the ratings were positive. Although the average score of 6.95 on the 1-10 scale was somewhat higher than in PY 2019, there is still room for improvement in the provision of supportive services.

Table 12. Supportive Services

	Count	Percent
8. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	1 Strongly disagree	805 8.5%
	2	225 2.4%
	3	223 2.4%
	4	233 2.5%
	5	447 4.7%
	6	372 3.9%
	7	444 4.7%
	8	666 7.1%
	9	759 8.0%
	10 Strongly agree	2123 22.5%
	Did not need support	3140 33.3%

Another aspect of the host agency experience relates to the convenience of the host agency assignment location. Finding a convenient location for the host agency assignment is a statutory requirement that depends on the transportation options of the participant and the remoteness of the host agency. Table 13 shows that 9 percent of participants experienced inconvenience based on the location of their assignment. This is two points lower than in the last three years.

Table 13. Geographic Convenience

9. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?		Count	Percent
	Yes	8059	91.0%
	No	796	9.0%
	Total	8855	100.0%

While the program elements discussed above provide support to participants during their host agency assignments, help in finding a job becomes critically important as the individual prepares to successfully exit. Question 20 asks how much help participants received from staff in finding employment. The participant rating of 7.7 is the lowest score for any question in the survey scored on a 10-point scale, but an increase of 0.5 of a point from PY 2019. While this is a significant improvement over the last survey, there is still much room for improvement especially since so many fewer participants were able to find employment during the pandemic.

Table 14. Help in Finding Employment

20. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
	1817	7.7	1	10

Variables Associated with the ACSI

There are two types of analyses associated with the customer satisfaction index. The first of these is a multi-variate analysis that seeks to identify local projects’ services and the aspects of service delivery that are most likely to improve overall satisfaction if those services and service delivery characteristics are improved. This is referred to as a driver analysis. The second is a bi-variate analysis used for questions that cannot be easily included in the driver analysis because they are multi-response questions, are only answered by a subset of respondents, or do not have a continuous set of scaled responses (the questions offer Yes/No or similar fixed choice answers).

A. Driver Analysis

Table 15 presents the results for the first type of analysis. The results are derived from all responses to the survey conducted in PY 2020 that answered the specific question at issue and all three of the questions that constitute the ACSI. Different regression models were tested to determine the smallest number of questions that explains the ACSI. The questions that together account for the most variation in the ACSI are shaded in Table 15 (Questions 6, 11, and 19). Question 19 is the same driver identified in PY 2019. Questions 6 and 11 are new drivers for PY 2020. Question 10 has previously been a driver and continues to be important although it did not provide enough unique explanatory power to be included. For details on the driver analysis methodology, see Appendix C.

The strongest driver Question 19 -- how helpful SCSEP is in preparing participants for the workforce -- is highly correlated with the ACSI and has a strong, unique influence on the ACSI. The large size of its correlation and its unique contribution to explaining the ACSI suggest that any change in this score is likely to have a direct and independent change on overall satisfaction. Question 6, while not a driver in PY 2019, has been a major driver in previous years. The correlation is very high, but, more important, its unique contribution to the ACSI is second only to that of Question 19.

Question 11 deals with the training received while at the host agency. The score for Question 11 is 8.6, among the highest scores for any questions. The experience with the host agency rounds out the participant's overall experience. Clear information for and expectation of the program, preparation toward success in the workforce, and appropriate training in the host agency assignment account for nearly all of the variation in satisfaction.

The shaded questions in Table 15 are not necessarily the only items that matter in relation to understanding the ACSI, however. What follows are two guiding principles for assessing the remaining questions and their relationship to the ACSI.

- Some questions not in the chosen regression model may have high correlations and moderate participant ratings (they are unshaded in Table 15 because they are not independent of the influence exerted by the shaded questions), suggesting room for improvement in the way the sub-grantee delivers services.
- Other questions may have a lower correlation with the ACSI but also lower than usual participant ratings, affording significant room for improvement in the way the sub-grantee delivers the service.

The unshaded questions in Table 15 should still be considered for program improvement based on these guiding principles.

Table 15. Driver Analysis

		Relation to ACSI
6. At the time I enrolled, the Older worker Program/SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	Pearson Correlation	.622
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9473
7. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	Pearson Correlation	.571
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9384
10. There is someone in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	Pearson Correlation	.592
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9287
11. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.598
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	8977
12. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.569
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

		Relation to ACSI
	N	9022
14. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	Pearson Correlation	.527
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9283
17. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	Pearson Correlation	.356
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9489
19. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	Pearson Correlation	.698
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	9199
20. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	Pearson Correlation	.572**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	1817

Although not a key driver, Question 12 is closely related to overall satisfaction as seen in Table 16. There is a 38-point difference in the ACSI score for those who felt they had the most say and those who felt they had the least say. Preparing participants for the workforce involves giving them the right skills, and the results for Question 12 suggest that providing the right skills should involve giving participants a say in identifying those skills most likely to prepare them for the workforce.

Table 16. Having a Say in Training and the ACSI

		Count	ACSI Score
12. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	1 Strongly disagree	431	57.9
	2	165	58.9
	3	212	68.4
	4	198	69.3
	5	450	75.4
	6	428	78.7
	7	596	82.6
	8	1136	86.2
	9	1470	90.2
	10 Strongly agree	3936	95.6

B. Other Questions Associated with the ACSI

Because of the way responses are structured in some of the questions, the contribution of those questions to explaining the ACSI is difficult to interpret through the multi-variate driver analysis detailed above. For each of these questions, however, there are notable changes in the average ACSI scores depending on the participants' level of response, as there was with Question 12. These differences provide additional guidance to local programs for improving overall satisfaction and the quality of their programs in ways that matter to participants. In Tables 17-19, the analyses include only those participants who answered the specific question at issue and all three of the questions that constitute the ACSI.

Obtaining supportive services can have an impact on the ACSI, but only for participants who needed those services. Because only 67 percent of the respondents indicated they needed supportive services, that feature of service was not entered into the driver model but is analyzed separately here. Table 17 shows the number of individuals who gave each rating on the scale of 1 = Strongly disagree to 10 = Strongly agree. As the table shows, the average ACSI score associated with each rating on the scale strongly rises as the level of agreement rises. Participants who strongly agreed that they had received the supportive services they needed had average ACSI scores of over 96, while those who strongly disagreed that they received the supportive services they needed had average ACSI scores of around 71. This difference of 25 points in scores highlights the critical importance of providing supportive services for those who need them.

Table 17. Supportive Services and ACSI

8. The Older Worker Program/SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	Count	ACSI Score
1 Strongly disagree	805	71.6
2	225	68.5
3	223	69.8
4	233	74.3
5	447	79.6
6	372	83.5
7	444	84.8
8	664	87.3
9	759	91.5
10 Strongly agree	2123	96.3
Did not need support	3140	89.5

There are two more important questions related to the ACSI that could not be included in the driver analysis. These questions also tell us something about how programs can increase participant satisfaction. The first is Question 13, participants' experience with computer training.

Table 18. Computer Training and ACSI

13. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	Count	ACSI Score
I received the computer training I needed	3209	91.6
I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs	1026	82.5
I needed computer training, but little or none was offered	2033	80.8
I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway	660	89.4
I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any	2268	87.9

For the thirty-five percent of respondents (3,209) who needed computer training and got what they needed, the ACSI is extremely high, 91.6. However, participants who did not receive the training that met their needs, or needed training but little was offered, have satisfaction scores 9-11 points lower. In addition, those who did not need training but got it anyway have an ACSI score close to the satisfaction rating for those who needed it and received it. These findings suggest that grantees should ensure that relevant computer training is provided and at least meets participants' needs even if the training exceeds the participants' actual needs.

Question 21, about preparation for different sectors of employment, also provides important guidance for local programs. Table 19 shows the average ACSI score for those who endorsed that they felt prepared in 1, 2, 3 or no sectors. 560 respondents answered the sector questions and the three ACSI questions. There are small, non-significant differences in the ACSI scores for those who said they were prepared for 1, 2, or all 3 sectors. However, all of those who felt prepared expressed significantly higher satisfaction than those who did not feel prepared for any sector: the difference in ACSI scores ranges from 19.8 to 23.1 points. In Table 19, the message is very clear: What matters is the quality of the preparation in general and not its relevance for any particular employment sector.

Table 19. Preparation for Employment and ACSI

21. Number of sectors for which the participant was prepared	Number of Respondents	ACSI Score
1 Sector	302	87.5
2 Sectors	95	87.9
3 Sectors	122	90.8
No Sectors	41	67.7

Summary and Recommendations

This survey of participants provides important guidance for grantees. Our first finding is from the COVID question (Question 4) we introduced because of the special circumstances created by the pandemic over the past program year. Over five thousand participants noted the inability to go to their assignment and the resulting loss of social contact as the critical impacts of COVID. This reminds us of the centrality of the host agency assignment to the participants' experience, and most important, the social contact the assignment provides.

The second finding from the survey results is that understanding participants' expectations for the program may help programs do a better job of serving their participants. As in previous years, the respondents tell us (Question 5) that full-time employment is not the primary goal of most participants. Beyond that, participants have a mix of motivations, and it will serve local programs well to talk with

participants at the start of enrollment and learn as much as they can about what participants hope to get from the program, as well as what their needs are to feel successful.

A third major finding is that preparation for the workforce (Question 19) is the single most important driver of participant satisfaction. With an average score of 8.5, there is still room for substantial improvement, and every point of improvement will yield significant increases in satisfaction. Staff help in finding employment (Question 20) is also an important part of preparing the path to employment. The average score of 7.7 for PY 2020 is 0.5 of a point higher than PY 2019, but it is still among the lowest scores on the survey and indicates that local programs can do considerably more in this area, whether it be for part-time or full-time employment.

The remaining recommendations in many ways flow from obtaining a better understanding of participants' interests and needs that should be derived from participants' assessments and reflected in their IEPs:

- Local programs need to spend time listening to participants to assess the skills participants will need to succeed in the workforce (Question 7).
- Local programs also need to work with host agencies to ensure participants have a voice in the skills they acquire while at their assignments (Question 12).
- Computer training (Question 13) is an area where local programs need to do a better job of identifying those who need training and the type of computer training that is most relevant for the individual participant. However, the data also indicated providing computer training even when not needed is better than not doing any computer training.
- Supportive services (Question 8) are not necessary for everyone (one-third did not need them), but for those who need supportive services, the failure to provide services significantly lowers overall satisfaction and reduces participant's chances for success in the program and in unsubsidized employment.

Appendix A Complete Survey Tables

Table 1. Response Rate by Grantee

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
AARP	528	54.7%	437	45.3%
ANPPM	266	73.3%	97	26.7%
ATD	240	65.4%	127	34.6%
Easter Seals	360	53.1%	318	46.9%
Goodwill	393	57.9%	286	42.1%
IID [S]	116	56.9%	88	43.1%
IPDC	46	69.7%	20	30.3%
National Able Network	242	66.3%	123	33.7%
NAPCA[S]	257	73.2%	94	26.8%
NAPCA[G]	251	68.2%	117	31.8%
NCBA	337	54.1%	286	45.9%
NCOA	467	56.8%	355	43.2%
NICOA[S]	158	65.0%	85	35.0%
NICOA[G]	172	68.0%	81	32.0%
NOWCC	88	56.8%	67	43.2%
NUL	277	66.4%	140	33.6%
OAGB	198	59.6%	134	40.4%
SER	256	62.3%	155	37.7%
CWI	484	57.7%	355	42.3%
The WorkPlace	231	63.3%	134	36.7%
VANTAGE	250	68.3%	116	31.7%
National Grantees	5617	60.8%	3615	39.2%
Alabama	95	60.9%	61	39.1%
Alaska	61	53.0%	54	47.0%
Arizona	32	48.5%	34	51.5%
Arkansas	68	51.5%	64	48.5%
California	230	66.3%	117	33.7%
Colorado	20	41.7%	28	58.3%
Connecticut	29	56.9%	22	43.1%
Delaware	74	56.5%	57	43.5%
DC	17	63.0%	10	37.0%
Florida	199	55.3%	161	44.7%
Georgia	117	63.6%	67	36.4%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Hawaii	67	53.2%	59	46.8%
Idaho	31	49.2%	32	50.8%
Illinois	139	59.9%	93	40.1%
Indiana	74	41.3%	105	58.7%
Iowa	40	44.0%	51	56.0%
Kansas	49	63.6%	28	36.4%
Kentucky	94	64.4%	52	35.6%
Louisiana	86	60.1%	57	39.9%
Maryland	55	61.1%	35	38.9%
Massachusetts	53	62.4%	32	37.6%
Michigan	139	66.2%	71	33.8%
Minnesota	89	52.7%	80	47.3%
Mississippi	69	71.9%	27	28.1%
Missouri	108	57.1%	81	42.9%
Montana	32	64.0%	18	36.0%
Nebraska	28	48.3%	30	51.7%
Nevada	23	54.8%	19	45.2%
New Hampshire	30	58.8%	21	41.2%
New Jersey	101	48.1%	109	51.9%
New Mexico	23	54.8%	19	45.2%
New York	208	67.8%	99	32.2%
North Carolina	139	69.5%	61	30.5%
North Dakota	27	46.6%	31	53.4%
Ohio	184	61.7%	114	38.3%
Oklahoma	79	64.8%	43	35.2%
Oregon	45	47.4%	50	52.6%
Pennsylvania	188	50.9%	181	49.1%
Puerto Rico	80	69.6%	35	30.4%
Rhode Island	14	56.0%	11	44.0%
South Carolina	80	55.9%	63	44.1%
South Dakota	34	75.6%	11	24.4%
Tennessee	82	52.2%	75	47.8%
Texas	194	53.2%	171	46.8%
Utah	32	50.8%	31	49.2%
Vermont	18	66.7%	9	33.3%
Virginia	99	61.9%	61	38.1%
Washington	31	55.4%	25	44.6%

	Responded		Did not respond	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
West Virginia	44	53.0%	39	47.0%
Wisconsin	114	60.0%	76	40.0%
Wyoming	24	48.0%	26	52.0%
State Grantees	3988	57.8%	2906	42.2%
Nationwide	9605	59.5%	6521	40.5%

Table 2. ACSI by Grantee

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
AARP	528	88.5	0	100
ANPPM	266	92.9	23	100
ATD	240	83.0	0	100
Easter Seals	360	83.8	0	100
Goodwill	393	87.0	0	100
IID [S]	116	92.7	0	100
IPDC	46	87.5	37	100
National Able Network	242	88.1	8	100
NAPCA[S]	257	89.8	19	100
NAPCA[G]	251	89.0	0	100
NCBA	337	86.0	0	100
NCOA	467	87.5	0	100
NICOA[S]	158	90.7	4	100
NICOA[G]	172	83.9	0	100
NOWCC	88	79.5	0	100
NUL	277	86.8	0	100
OAGB	198	87.9	11	100
SER	256	85.5	0	100
CWI	484	89.7	0	100
The WorkPlace	231	86.7	0	100
VANTAGE	250	89.0	37	100
National Grantees	5617	87.6	0	100
Alabama	95	88.9	0	100
Alaska	61	85.7	33	100
Arizona	32	80.9	41	100
Arkansas	68	78.2	0	100
California	230	90.6	7	100
Colorado	20	87.8	0	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Connecticut	29	84.9	36	100
Delaware	74	91.3	40	100
DC	17	89.8	0	100
Florida	199	88.1	4	100
Georgia	117	90.7	15	100
Hawaii	67	83.3	0	100
Idaho	31	82.5	39	100
Illinois	139	89.5	11	100
Indiana	74	82.0	0	100
Iowa	40	81.5	4	100
Kansas	49	86.1	15	100
Kentucky	94	89.5	0	100
Louisiana	86	90.9	4	100
Maryland	55	84.5	11	100
Massachusetts	53	83.7	0	100
Michigan	139	89.6	10	100
Minnesota	89	86.1	8	100
Mississippi	69	91.9	41	100
Missouri	108	91.1	22	100
Montana	32	76.8	0	100
Nebraska	28	88.7	38	100
Nevada	23	94.7	44	100
New Hampshire	30	76.5	7	100
New Jersey	101	84.4	0	100
New Mexico	23	83.8	0	100
New York	208	88.8	11	100
North Carolina	139	93.2	45	100
North Dakota	27	69.9	0	100
Ohio	184	87.3	0	100
Oklahoma	79	86.1	22	100
Oregon	45	76.7	0	100
Pennsylvania	188	84.6	0	100
Puerto Rico	80	87.9	0	100
Rhode Island	14	94.2	78	100
South Carolina	80	85.9	0	100
South Dakota	34	82.7	11	100
Tennessee	82	86.6	0	100
Texas	194	82.8	0	100

	Count	ACSI	Minimum	Maximum
Utah	32	79.3	22	100
Vermont	18	73.6	0	100
Virginia	99	90.6	7	100
Washington	31	74.7	0	100
West Virginia	44	78.2	0	100
Wisconsin	114	86.3	0	100
Wyoming	24	74.9	0	100
State Grantees	3988	86.7	0	100
Nationwide	9605	87.2	0	100

Table 3. Effect of COVID

Q4. How has the COVID-19 pandemic affected you as a SCSEP participant?			Count	Percent of Responses
National Grantees	Effects of COVID	1. I was not allowed to go to my assigned host agency.	3134	30.9%
		2. I refused to go to my assignment because i was afraid I would get sick.	394	3.9%
		3. I went to my host agency, but I was worried about getting sick when traveling to and from the assignment or working at my assignment.	620	6.1%
		4. I lost my host agency assignment and the money associated with that assignment.	268	2.6%
		5. I received pay but missed the social contact I would have had if I had been able to go to my assignment.	3182	31.4%
		6. I was not able to find unsubsidized employment because employers are closed or not hiring.	1139	11.2%
		7. I experienced little or no effect from the COVID-19 pandemic.	1405	13.9%
State Grantees	Effects of COVID	1. I was not allowed to go to my assigned host agency.	2205	31.6%
		2. I refused to go to my assignment because i was afraid I would get sick.	222	3.2%
		3. I went to my host agency, but I was worried about getting sick when	413	5.9%

Q4. How has the COVID-19 pandemic affected you as a SCSEP participant?			Count	Percent of Responses
		traveling to and from the assignment or working at my assignment.		
		4. I lost my host agency assignment and the money associated with that assignment.	199	2.8%
		5. I received pay but missed the social contact I would have had if I had been able to go to my assignment.	2236	32.0%
		6. I was not able to find unsubsidized employment because employers are closed or not hiring.	716	10.2%
		7. I experienced little or no effect from the COVID-19 pandemic.	995	14.2%
Nationwide	Effects of COVID	1. I was not allowed to go to my assigned host agency.	5339	31.2%
		2. I refused to go to my assignment because i was afraid I would get sick.	616	3.6%
		3. I went to my host agency, but I was worried about getting sick when traveling to and from the assignment or working at my assignment.	1033	6.0%
		4. I lost my host agency assignment and the money associated with that assignment.	467	2.7%
		5. I received pay but missed the social contact I would have had if I had been able to go to my assignment.	5418	31.6%
		6. I was not able to find unsubsidized employment because employers are closed or not hiring.	1855	10.8%
		7. I experienced little or no effect from the COVID-19 pandemic.	2400	14.0%

Table 4. Reasons for Enrolling

			Count	Percent of Responses
National Grantees	Reason for Enrollment	1. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program.	1392	7.2%
		2. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program.	3067	15.9%
		3. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities.	2500	13.0%
		4. Provide service to my community.	2484	12.9%
		5. Meet new people.	2465	12.8%
		6. Increase my income.	3459	18.0%
		7. Feel more useful and independent.	3516	18.3%
		8. Other	369	1.9%
State Grantees	Reason for Enrollment	1. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program.	911	6.6%
		2. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program.	2201	16.0%
		3. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities.	1786	13.0%
		4. Provide service to my community.	1781	13.0%
		5. Meet new people.	1769	12.9%
		6. Increase my income.	2559	18.6%
		7. Feel more useful and independent.	2469	18.0%
		8. Other	272	2.0%
Nationwide	Reason for Enrollment	1. Obtain a full-time job after completing the program.	2303	7.0%
		2. Obtain a part-time job after completing the program.	5268	16.0%
		3. Participate in the program's training and host agency activities.	4286	13.0%
		4. Provide service to my community.	4265	12.9%
		5. Meet new people.	4234	12.8%
		6. Increase my income.	6018	18.2%
		7. Feel more useful and independent.	5985	18.1%
		8. Other	641	1.9%

Table 5. Treatment of Participants

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	6. At the time I enrolled, the SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	5527	9.1	1	10
	7. The SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	5491	8.9	1	10
	10. There is someone in SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	5431	8.9	1	10
State Grantees	6. At the time I enrolled, the SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	3946	9.0	1	10
	7. The SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	3893	8.9	1	10
	10. There is someone in SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	3856	8.8	1	10
Nationwide	6. At the time I enrolled, the SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	9473	9.1	1	10
	7. The SCSEP staff gave me a host agency assignment that matched my employment interests and needs.	9384	8.9	1	10
	10. There is someone in SCSEP I can talk to when I need to.	9287	8.9	1	10

Table 6. Supportive Services

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	8. SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	Strongly disagree	474 8.6%
		2	130 2.4%
		3	134 2.4%
		4	142 2.6%
		5	273 5.0%
		6	211 3.8%
		7	269 4.9%
		8	413 7.5%
		9	444 8.1%
		Strongly agree	1223 22.2%

		Did not need support	1801	32.7%
State Grantees	8. SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	Strongly disagree	331	8.4%
		2	95	2.4%
		3	89	2.3%
		4	91	2.3%
		5	174	4.4%
		6	161	4.1%
		7	175	4.5%
		8	253	6.4%
		9	315	8.0%
		Strongly agree	901	23.0%
				Did not need support
Nationwide	8. SCSEP helped me obtain the supportive services, such as assistance with transportation, housing, or medical care, that I needed to meet my employment goals.	Strongly disagree	805	8.5%
		2	225	2.4%
		3	223	2.4%
		4	233	2.5%
		5	447	4.7%
		6	372	3.9%
		7	444	4.7%
		8	666	7.1%
		9	759	8.0%
		Strongly agree	2123	22.5%
				Did not need support

Table 7. Geographic Convenience

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	9. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	4657	90.0%
		No	515	10.0%
State Grantees	9. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	3402	92.4%
		No	281	7.6%
Nationwide	9. Given your transportation situation, was your host agency assignment convenient to where you live?	Yes	8059	91.0%
		No	796	9.0%

Table 8. Host Agency Experience

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	11. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	5269	8.6	1	10
	12. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	5293	8.1	1	10
	14. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	5433	9.0	1	10
State Grantees	11. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	3708	8.6	1	10
	12. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	3729	8.1	1	10
	14. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	3850	9.0	1	10
Nationwide	11. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	8977	8.6	1	10
	12. I had a say in the types of skills I would gain during my host agency assignment.	9022	8.1	1	10
	14. I feel comfortable at my host agency assignment.	9283	9.0	1	10

Table 9. Computer Training

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	13. Which of the following best describes you experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed.	1863	34.7%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs.	594	11.1%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered.	1228	22.9%

			Count	Percent
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	388	7.2%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	1296	24.1%
State Grantees	13. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed.	1346	35.2%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs.	432	11.3%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered.	805	21.0%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	272	7.1%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	972	25.4%
Nationwide	13. Which of the following best describes your experience with computer training?	I received the computer training I needed.	3209	34.9%
		I received computer training, but it didn't meet my needs.	1026	11.2%
		I needed computer training, but little or none was offered.	2033	22.1%
		I didn't need computer training but was given the training anyway.	660	7.2%
		I didn't need computer training and didn't receive any.	2268	24.7%

Table 10. Physical Health

	15. Compared to the time before you started working with SCSEP, would you say your physical health is better, worse, or about the same?					
	Better		Worse		About the same	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
National Grantees	1660	30.6%	517	9.5%	3251	59.9%
State Grantees	1114	29.0%	400	10.4%	2329	60.6%
Nationwide	2774	29.9%	917	9.9%	5580	60.2%

Table 11. Outlook on Life

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	16. Compared to the time before you started working with SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	92	1.7%
		A little more negative	224	4.1%
		About the same	967	17.6%
		A little more positive	1491	27.1%
		Much more positive	2718	49.5%
State Grantees	16. Compared to the time before you started working with SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	68	1.7%
		A little more negative	155	4.0%
		About the same	716	18.3%
		A little more positive	1032	26.4%
		Much more positive	1945	49.7%
Nationwide	16. Compared to the time before you started working with SCSEP, how would you rate your outlook on life?	Much more negative	160	1.7%
		A little more negative	379	4.0%
		About the same	1683	17.9%
		A little more positive	2523	26.8%
		Much more positive	4663	49.6%

Table 12. SCSEP Wages

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	17. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	91	1.6%
		2	46	0.8%
		3	66	1.2%
		4	62	1.1%
		5	170	3.1%
		6	169	3.0%
		7	244	4.4%
		8	475	8.6%
		9	583	10.5%
		10 Strongly agree	3647	65.7%

			Count	Percent
State Grantees	17. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	88	2.2%
		2	38	1.0%
		3	37	0.9%
		4	51	1.3%
		5	132	3.4%
		6	92	2.3%
		7	179	4.5%
		8	317	8.1%
		9	394	10.0%
		10 Strongly agree	2608	66.3%
Nationwide	17. The income I receive from the Older Worker Program/SCSEP is important for meeting my basic expenses.	1 Strongly disagree	179	1.9%
		2	84	0.9%
		3	103	1.1%
		4	113	1.2%
		5	302	3.2%
		6	261	2.8%
		7	423	4.5%
		8	792	8.3%
		9	977	10.3%
		10 Strongly agree	6255	65.9%

Table 13. Pressure to Leave the Program

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	18. During my host agency assignment, SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	223	6.0%
		No	3520	94.0%
State Grantees	18. During my host agency assignment, SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	170	6.5%
		No	2454	93.5%
Nationwide	18. During my host agency assignment, SCSEP staff pressured me to leave my host agency assignment for a job before I was ready.	Yes	393	6.2%
		No	5974	93.8%

Table 14. Preparation for Success in Workforce

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	19. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	5406	8.5	1	10
State Grantees	19. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	3793	8.4	1	10
Nationwide	19. Overall, how helpful has the Older Worker Program/SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	9199	8.5	1	10

Table 15. Help in Finding Employment

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	20. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	1108	7.9	1	10
State Grantees	20. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	709	7.5	1	10
Nationwide	20. How much help did Older Worker Program/SCSEP staff give you in finding employment?	1817	7.7	1	10

Table 16. Prepared for Employment

		Count	Percent of Responses
National Grantees	1. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	213	39.7%
	2. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization.	124	23.1%
	3. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business.	180	33.5%
	4. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	20	3.7%
State Grantees	1. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	142	39.2%
	2. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization.	83	22.9%
	3. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business.	116	32.0%

		Count	Percent of Responses
	4. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	21	5.8%
Nationwide	1. I felt prepared for employment in a nonprofit organization.	355	39.1%
	2. I felt prepared for employment in a government organization.	207	23.0%
	3. I felt prepared for employment in a for-profit business.	296	32.9%
	4. I did not feel prepared for employment in any organization or business.	41	4.6%

Table 17. Employment Preparation by Sectors

21. Do you feel that your participation in the Older Worker Program/SCSEP prepared you for employment in these organizations?			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Number of sectors	1 sector	173	52.7%
		2 sectors	55	16.8%
		All 3 sectors	78	23.8%
		No sectors	22	6.7%
State Grantees	Number of sectors	1 sector	129	55.6%
		2 sectors	40	17.2%
		All 3 sectors	44	19.0%
		No sectors	19	8.2%
Nationwide	Number of sectors	1 sector	302	53.9%
		2 sectors	95	17.0%
		All 3 sectors	122	21.8%
		No sectors	41	7.3%

Appendix B
Respondent Demographics and Characteristics

Table 1. Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Education

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Gender	Male	1787	31.8%
		Female	3824	68.2%
	Race	White	2354	44.4%
		Black	2305	43.5%
		Asian	376	7.1%
		American Indian	249	4.7%
		Pacific Islander	14	0.3%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	606	10.8%
		Not Hispanic	5006	89.2%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	979	17.4%
		HS Diploma/GED	2268	40.4%
		Some college	1264	22.5%
BA/BS		534	9.5%	
Bachelor's Plus		207	3.7%	
Vocational/technical degree		104	1.9%	
Post-secondary certificate		255	4.5%	
State Grantees	Gender	Male	1170	29.4%
		Female	2807	70.6%
	Race	White	1964	51.7%
		Black	1631	43.0%
		Asian	104	2.7%
		American Indian	79	2.1%
		Pacific Islander	19	0.5%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	424	10.6%
		Not Hispanic	3564	89.4%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	558	14.0%
		HS Diploma/GED	1630	40.9%
		Some college	927	23.3%
BA/BS		405	10.2%	
Bachelor's Plus		159	4.0%	
Vocational/technical degree		109	2.7%	
Post-secondary certificate		199	5.0%	

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Gender	Male	2957	30.8%
		Female	6631	69.2%
	Race	White	4318	47.5%
		Black	3936	43.3%
		Asian	480	5.3%
		American Indian	328	3.6%
		Pacific Islander	33	0.4%
	Ethnicity	Hispanic	1030	10.7%
		Not Hispanic	8570	89.3%
	Education	Less than HS diploma	1537	16.0%
		HS Diploma/GED	3898	40.6%
		Some college	2191	22.8%
		BA/BS	939	9.8%
		Bachelor's Plus	366	3.8%
Vocational/technical degree		213	2.2%	
Post-secondary certificate		454	4.7%	

Table 2. Barriers to Employment

			Count	Percent
National Grantees	Disability	Yes	1894	34.1%
		No	3660	65.9%
	LEP	Yes	513	11.6%
		No	3927	88.4%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	1425	25.9%
		No	4071	74.1%
	Rural	Yes	1436	25.6%
		No	4179	74.4%
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	5227	93.1%
		No	387	6.9%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	3292	58.6%
		No	2322	41.4%
	Veteran	Yes	556	9.9%
		No	5035	90.1%
	Severe Disability	Yes	121	2.7%
		No	4331	97.3%
	Frail	Yes	55	1.2%
		No	4395	98.8%

			Count	Percent
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	143	3.2%
		No	4339	96.8%
	Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services	Yes	1254	22.3%
		No	4358	77.7%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	1162	26.0%
		No	3314	74.0%
	Seventy-five Plus	Yes	380	6.8%
		No	5237	93.2%
	Formerly Incarcerated	Yes	23	1.5%
		No	1552	98.5%
State Grantees	Disability	Yes	1311	33.4%
		No	2616	66.6%
	LEP	Yes	218	6.4%
		No	3209	93.6%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	903	22.7%
		No	3083	77.3%
	Rural	Yes	1217	30.5%
		No	2771	69.5%
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	3456	86.7%
		No	531	13.3%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	1906	47.9%
		No	2072	52.1%
	Veteran	Yes	422	10.6%
		No	3565	89.4%
	Severe Disability	Yes	89	2.6%
		No	3390	97.4%
	Frail	Yes	64	1.8%
		No	3409	98.2%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	132	3.8%
		No	3338	96.2%
	Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services	Yes	811	20.4%
		No	3167	79.6%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	643	18.4%
		No	2844	81.6%
	Seventy-five Plus	Yes	338	8.5%
		No	3650	91.5%
	Formerly Incarcerated	Yes	23	2.0%
		No	1126	98.0%

			Count	Percent
Nationwide	Disability	Yes	3205	33.8%
		No	6276	66.2%
	LEP	Yes	731	9.3%
		No	7136	90.7%
	Low Literacy Skills	Yes	2328	24.6%
		No	7154	75.4%
	Rural	Yes	2653	27.6%
		No	6950	72.4%
	Low Employment Prospects	Yes	8683	90.4%
		No	918	9.6%
	Homeless or at Risk	Yes	5198	54.2%
		No	4394	45.8%
	Veteran	Yes	978	10.2%
		No	8600	89.8%
	Severe Disability	Yes	210	2.6%
		No	7721	97.4%
	Frail	Yes	119	1.5%
		No	7804	98.5%
	Old Enough for but Not Receiving Social Security	Yes	275	3.5%
		No	7677	96.5%
	Failed to Find Employment After WIOA Services	Yes	2065	21.5%
		No	7525	78.5%
	Severely Limited Employment Prospects	Yes	1805	22.7%
		No	6158	77.3%
	Seventy-five Plus	Yes	718	7.5%
		No	8887	92.5%
	Formerly Incarcerated	Yes	46	1.7%
		No	2678	98.3%

Table 3. Average Barriers per Participant

		Count	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
National Grantees	Number of Barriers	5617	3.2	0	9
State Grantees	Number of Barriers	3988	2.9	0	8
Nationwide	Number of Barriers	9605	3.0	0	9

Table 4. Age

		Count	Percent
National Grantees	Less than 65	2487	44.3%
	65 or older	3124	55.7%
State Grantees	Less than 65	1680	42.2%
	65 or older	2303	57.8%
Nationwide	Less than 65	4167	43.4%
	65 or older	5427	56.6%

Appendix C

Driver Model

Table 1 provides the foundation for the methodology used to choose the services and service delivery questions that have the strongest independent effect on overall satisfaction. This is the simplest model while accounting for the most variation in the ACSI.

The third column shows the size of the t-test value, and the fourth column shows that all three questions are significant beyond chance. Beta, the second column, should be read as the strength of the relationship between the question and the ACSI score. For every one-unit increase in Beta, the ACSI increases by one standard deviation. For example, a one-unit increase in preparing participants for success (8.5 to 9.5) will increase the ACSI by .438 standard deviations or 8.3 points on the ACSI scale.⁶ Given the fact that the average score for Question 19 is 8.5, there some significant opportunity for local programs to improve preparation for the workforce and thereby significantly improve overall satisfaction.

Table 1: Driver Model Test

	Standardized Coefficients	t-test Value	Sig.
	Beta		
19. Overall, how helpful has SCSEP been in preparing you for success in the workforce?	.438	16.953	<.001
6. At the time I enrolled, the SCSEP staff told me what I needed to know about how the program worked and what to expect.	.270	14.175	<.001
11. During my community service assignment, my host agency gave me the training I needed to be successful in my assignment.	.198	11.730	<.001

⁶ The standard deviation for the nationwide ACSI is 18.8. The number of points is obtained by multiplying the Beta times the standard deviation.